Parry's showerhead must be capable of delivering a drenching supply of water on demand in an extreme emergency, for example to safely flush a person whose clothes, skin and/or hair are on fire or ravaged by caustic chemicals. Parry describes his shower system as including a 1 ½ inch ID piping system (col. 4, line 29). This considerably enlarged diameter will deliver nine times the flow volume of residential shower pipes which typically include only ½ inch ID piping. Applicant contends that such a high volume flow is wholly incompatible with typical showerhead spray holes.

Parry makes no mention of the use of spray holes on showerhead face 15. In fact, it is highly likely there are no openings at all, other than the open-ended conduit common to industrial emergency shower systems. The demand for a copious flow of water could overwhelm smaller spray holes and result in delivery of a spray so forceful as to be painfully devastating to chemically burned eye tissue or burn-excoriated skin.

Thus, in any event, Applicant asserts that spray holes are by no means *inherently implied*. That said, it is important to note that Applicant's claimed invention distinguishes from the prior art in other ways, as well.

A distinguishing feature present in all pending claims is the inclusion of a valve positioned upstream of said spray holes. To meet this claimed feature, the Examiner argues that Parry's system could be modified in view of Langdon